



475513

Lusher Street Proposed Plan Public Meeting

Date: Tuesday, April 29, 2014

Time: 6:31 p.m.

Place: Calvary United Methodist Church
2222 West Indiana Avenue
Elkhart, Indiana 46516

Before Jeanne R. Drust, AAS
Notary Public, Elkhart County, Indiana

MIDWEST REPORTING, INC.
1448 Lincolnway East
South Bend, Indiana 46613
reporters@midwestreporting.net
(574) 288-4242

COPY

1
2 APPEARANCES:

3 MS. TERESA JONES

4 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
5 Community Involvement Coordinator

6 MR. PRABHAKAR KASARABADA

7 Indiana Department of Environmental Management
8 Environmental Manager, Federal Programs Section

9 MR. THOMAS KRUEGER

10 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
11 Region 5 Office of Regional Counsel

12 MR. SYED QUADRI

13 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
14 Remedial Project Manager

15 MR. KEITH FUSINKSI

16 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
17 Risk Assessor

18 MR. WILLIAM EARLE

19 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
20 Contractor

21 MS. GINA CAMPUZANO

22 Tetra Tech, Inc.
23 Office Administrator
24 gina.campuzano@tetrattech.com
25

1 MS. JONES: Good evening, everyone. I would like to
2 thank you all for coming out, and the purpose of this
3 meeting is to discuss the Lusher groundwater cleanup
4 plan. My name is Teresa Jones, and I'm with the EPA, and
5 I will be facilitating this evening's meeting. And I
6 would like to start out by introducing the team. To my
7 immediate right is Syed Quadri. He's the project manager
8 for the site, and also with us we have Dr. Keith
9 Fusinski. He's the risk assessor for the site. And we
10 also have with us Tom Krueger. He's an EPA attorney for
11 the site. And we also have Steve with us.

12 MR. EARLE: William.

13 MS. JONES: William Earle. I'm sorry. William
14 Earle. He's an EPA contractor, and we also have
15 Prabhakar. I'm not going to butcher his last name, but
16 he's in one of our state departments.

17 And before we start the meeting, I would like to go
18 over a few ground rules. We want to start out with a few
19 presentations. The first will be given by Dr. Keith
20 Fusinski. And following Keith, we will have a couple of
21 presentations by Syed, and then we are going to open up
22 the session for a brief moment for a quick question and
23 answer session.

24 And then immediately following that, we will open up
25 the session for the public comment period. And at that

1 time, for those who will be making presentations for the
2 record, we would ask that you state and spell your name
3 for the court reporter. And if you choose not to make an
4 oral comment this evening, or question, you will also
5 have another opportunity to submit your comments. You
6 can use the pullout that you will find in the fact sheet
7 that was given to you, and you can mail that back to our
8 offices, or you can go online to our website for the
9 site, and you can present your comment there. And also
10 there's a fourth option. The community involvement
11 coordinator for the site is Cheryl Allen. You can also
12 email her your comments, and her contact information is
13 included in the fact sheets.

14 So with no further ado, I'm going to turn the
15 evening over to Dr. Keith Fusinski.

16 DR. FUSINSKI: Okay. Can everyone hear me? Yes?
17 Okay. I was asked to come here for two things. First of
18 all, my name is Keith Fusinski. I'm a toxicologist for
19 the EPA, human health risk assessor, and I was asked to
20 come here to discuss what a risk assessment is and what
21 vapor intrusion is, because all the decisions we make are
22 based on a risk assessment, among other things, and vapor
23 intrusion is one of the problems that you guys have here,
24 and I want you to understand. Yes?

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: Excuse me for a minute. If

1 you hold the mic a little closer to your mouth, we can
2 hear you.

3 DR. FUSINSKI: I can do that.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: Thank you.

5 DR. FUSINSKI: All right. So what is a risk
6 assessment? A risk assessment is a tool that the EPA
7 uses to characterize the nature and magnitude of health
8 risk to humans and ecological receptors. I do human
9 health. I don't do ecological.

10 So we look at -- we characterize the risks from --
11 there's a pointer on this, right? From chemical
12 contaminants and other stressors that may be present in
13 the environment. So I do the risk assessment. I get
14 some numbers. I give these numbers to the risk manager,
15 and from that, they make a decision on what to do.

16 To the highest extent possible, this is a scientific
17 process. It's based on what chemicals are here, what is
18 the toxicity of those chemicals, how are people exposed
19 to those chemicals, and how long are they exposed to
20 these chemicals. And we put those in an equation, and I
21 get a number. And with that number, we determine if
22 there's an acceptable or unacceptable risk, and I'll
23 explain what that is in a minute.

24 So a few things that I need you to know right off
25 the top. A risk assessment is not a study of health

1 conditions you may already have. It is not a re-creation
2 of ways that you may have been exposed to contaminants in
3 the past. And it is not a study of how whether any
4 existing problems that you may have now are linked to
5 contamination that you have been exposed to in the past.

6 As I've said in the public meeting before which I
7 like, there is a federal agency that does do these. It's
8 called ATSDR, and they do what's called a health
9 consultation, and that is looking at everything in the
10 past and what it may have done to the people in the
11 neighborhood. My job is not to look in the past. My job
12 is to protect you now and your children and your
13 grandchildren and so on and so forth.

14 So risk assessment is a tool to assist the EPA in
15 protecting human health. It's a comprehensive study of
16 various ways that people may be in contact with these
17 chemicals. It's a calculation of how likely it is that
18 human health effects might occur from exposure to those
19 chemicals.

20 Now, when we do -- when I do a risk assessment, I
21 look at two different things. Some chemicals cause
22 cancer. Some chemicals have other effects instead of
23 cancer. So we get two different numbers. So we're going
24 to look at this graph over here. This is noncancerous.
25 The way noncancer is done, everything in the world is a

1 toxin in the right dose. If you get a headache, you take
2 Tylenol, it goes away if you follow the directions on the
3 bottle. If you start taking more than what's recommended
4 on the bottle, it becomes a toxin that causes liver
5 damage. Everything is a toxin in a certain dose.
6 Scientists figure out what these doses are, the highest
7 concentration that we can give somebody over 30 years and
8 they won't have a toxic effect from it, and they figure
9 out that dose that someone can have every single day for
10 30 years, and that's called a reference dose.

11 And I look at -- to figure out what the dose you
12 guys have or are exposed to here, I look at the
13 concentrations in the water and the air and the soil, and
14 I do what's called a residential exposure. I calculate
15 it based on you being exposed to that chemical, in
16 whatever concentration it is, 24 hours a day, 350 days a
17 year for 30 years. So if you're not in your home for
18 24 hours a day, 350 days a year for 30 years, then I'm
19 overestimating your dose. But worst case scenario, we do
20 350 days a year because we let you leave for two weeks
21 for vacation.

22 So basically, I calculate a number what's your
23 average daily dose, and I divide it by that reference
24 dose. If they're equal, that number will be one. If
25 your average daily dose is below that reference dose,

1 you're going to be less than. Does that make sense? So
2 you're getting a dose below the amount that scientists
3 have figured out is not going to cause a toxin level.
4 U.S. EPA recommends that your noncancer (inaudible) be
5 less than one. We'll accept one, because the scientists
6 have said this is the largest dose you can have every day
7 for 30 years that won't have an effect. So if you're at
8 one, if you're at that dose every day, you should be
9 fine. If you're below that dose, you're better. The
10 office of (inaudible) emergency management says that
11 you're three times that dose, we have to do a removal
12 action right now.

13 This graph here is cancer. Cancer is different,
14 because there is no here's a safe amount you can have,
15 and here's an amount that causes cancer. It doesn't
16 matter if you smoke four packs of cigarettes a day or if
17 you take one drag off a cigarette in your entire
18 lifetime. It all adds up to your risk of getting cancer.

19 Now, if you were to look at the risk assessment or
20 any other EPA documents, you'll see numbers like ten to
21 the minus six, ten to the minus four. People say stuff
22 like this all the time. Those numbers mean nothing to
23 anybody except for me. Ten to the minus six means it's a
24 one in a million chance of getting cancer from exposure
25 to that chemical. Ten to the minus four means it's a one

1 in 10,000 chance. So if we say that we want to protect
2 you from a ten to the minus six cancer risk, that means
3 that if we take a million people, put them in your
4 basement or in your house for 30 years -- or 70 years,
5 actually, for cancer, there's a chance that one of them
6 might get cancer for exposure to chemicals that's one of
7 the contaminants here. Does that make sense? Okay.

8 U.S. EPA recommends a one in a million cancer risk.
9 We want you down here. We will accept one in 10,000 over
10 one in a million as an acceptable cancer risk. Now, your
11 chances of getting some form of cancer in your lifetime,
12 according to the American Cancer Society, if you're
13 female, it's one in three, which is up here. And if
14 you're male, it's one in two. So when we say an
15 acceptable risk is one in 10,000, we're actually
16 protecting you from your one in 3.00001 additional excess
17 lifetime cancer risk. Does that make sense to everybody?
18 Okay. Good.

19 That's the risk assessment. I calculate these
20 numbers based on a 24-hour a day exposure for 30 years,
21 350 days a year for 30 years, and I give those numbers to
22 Syed, and Syed takes all the other factors into
23 consideration and says, do we need to do a removal or
24 not.

25 Okay. The problem that we have here -- one of the

1 problems is vapor intrusion. Vapor intrusion is a
2 migration of volatile chemicals from the subsurface into
3 overlying buildings. Basically, it's gases coming up
4 from the ground into your homes. All right.

5 So there's three conditions that have to be in
6 effect to have a complete vapor intrusion pathway. You
7 must have chemicals in the ground or in the groundwater
8 that can volatilize, they must be able to volatilize, and
9 you must have a structure those for vapors to get into,
10 because vapors cannot intrude into a building if there's
11 no building. Does that make sense?

12 So it sort of looks like this. This is very
13 convoluted, and there's a lot on here, but this is the
14 part you want to pay attention to. So here's the
15 chemicals that leak into the ground that volatilize.
16 What they do is they hit the groundwater, and as it moves
17 across with the groundwater, basically heading toward the
18 river, these chemicals can volatilize. They come up into
19 your houses. Basically, they need cracks and crevices in
20 your slab for the stuff to come into your houses.

21 Now, we have two ways of going about looking for
22 this, and we've already done an investigation into some
23 of the houses here where they've actually went in,
24 drilled holes in the floor, and found levels of vapors
25 below the houses and even in the houses that are

1 unacceptable. Now, we could go through every single
2 house in the neighborhood and test, and we know that it's
3 already in the groundwater. We already know the stuff is
4 in the subsurface. So if we come and test your house
5 once and there's nothing there, does that mean we don't
6 have a problem? No. It just means the vapors aren't
7 there yet. So we come back three months later. We test
8 again. Are they there? No. We've got to come back
9 three months later, test again. And this could go on and
10 on and on and on.

11 The other thing we do now is called preemptive
12 mitigation. So what we do is instead of coming back to
13 your house and drilling holes in your floor and doing all
14 the stuff over and over, we drill a two- to three-inch
15 hole in your floor -- and you'll see a picture of this --
16 and we basically put a pipe that goes into your basement
17 or your slab where it's connected to a fan, and it
18 basically draws the vapors up from under the ground,
19 draws them up to the atmosphere, and these vapors break
20 down in UV light.

21 Now, my recommendation to everybody, because my job
22 is protect human health, and I don't care about anything
23 else. I don't want people exposed. I don't want kids
24 exposed. I don't want children exposed. I want the
25 vapors gone. The best way to do that is to let us come

1 into your house and put these extraction systems on that
2 they'll be talking about later, because he put me first
3 for some reason, so I have to do this first. But Syed is
4 going to talk to you more about this. But when people
5 come to your door and start asking if they can come in
6 and do this, my advice to you as a human health
7 specialist is to let them in, because the sooner we get
8 this stuff out of your house, even if they've never
9 tested your house and never done anything underneath the
10 sub-slab, why wait? Why even take the chance of having
11 these vapors show up when we can do something to get rid
12 of them now? Okay. That's my story. Any questions for
13 me? None? Good. Okay. Yes. One.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Who pays for the extraction
15 systems?

16 DR. FUSINSKI: What's that?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: Who pays for it?

18 DR. FUSINSKI: He will talk to you all about that.
19 I just give you an outline of the (inaudible).

20 MR. DICKERSON: One question. Brian Dickerson. I
21 represent the Elkhart City Council. I showed up about
22 five minutes late or so. Have you discussed what the
23 contaminants are?

24 DR. FUSINSKI: He will take care of all that.

25 MR. DICKERSON: And have you discussed what will be

1 the cost to homeowners?

2 DR. FUSINSKI: That's all I have.

3 MR. DICKERSON: I'll wait.

4 DR. FUSINSKI: I could give you a number. That's
5 all I have.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: I have a question. Where
7 is this pool of contaminants exactly?

8 DR. FUSINSKI: He'll tell you about those. This is
9 actually the main plume right here. And what we do in
10 order to be protected is we have to move out -- just
11 because the groundwater is contaminated here, the vapors
12 don't always follow the groundwater. They go all
13 different directions. We actually do a buffer zone
14 around that groundwater when we put these things in.

15 I can only take one more, and that's it. You have a
16 question?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 4: How long have you known
18 about this contaminant?

19 DR. FUSINSKI: That's all him. That's all him.
20 Syed, I give you yours. He'll tell you a brief history
21 the first thing.

22 MR. QUADRI: Thank you, Keith. My name is Syed
23 Quadri. I'm the remedial project manager for the Lusher
24 groundwater -- Lusher Street, not Lusher Avenue. Lusher
25 Street groundwater contamination site. Can you all hear

1 me very well? Everybody can hear me very well? Okay.

2 So basically, the purpose of this presentation is
3 this: to provide you with a brief history of the site,
4 along with the previous activities that we did. There's
5 a lot of historical information that has been related to
6 the site, and it's my job to tell you exactly what the
7 history is and also explain to you the nature and extent
8 of contamination, what did we find, what kind of samples
9 we collected, what was the issue, what was the risk that
10 Keith was just talking about, and also what is the
11 proposal, what are we going to do with it?

12 As Keith mentioned, we sampled, we crunched the
13 numbers, and (inaudible) finds if there's a risk from
14 that chemical at the site, then we pick up from there,
15 and we say, okay, well, we've got a problem. What do we
16 do with it? What are the options that we have in front
17 of us? And then we select that option, and your
18 participation is very critical in that decision-making
19 process. We are required by law to come to you, the
20 community, and present them with the study, the proposal
21 the EPA is giving, and have you comment on it, have you
22 question it, and then basically, it's part of a decision
23 process for your input.

24 A little bit about the Superfund cleanup process,
25 which I'm going to give you this slide, which is a better

1 slide than all that text written in there. This is
2 basically a slide that shows you the Superfund process in
3 a nutshell. Primary assessment site investigations.
4 That's how the site gets listed on the NPL. NPL is a
5 National Priority List for the Superfund program. And
6 once the site scores high on the NPL, it become a
7 Superfund site, which this is. This is a Superfund site.
8 And once it is a Superfund site, an RPM is assigned to
9 it. An RPM collects the data to evaluate the
10 contamination, the nature and extent of contamination,
11 the site risks, the various options to clean up the risk,
12 to clean up the contamination, and to minimize and to
13 eliminate the risk, and that's exactly what we do as part
14 of RI, which is remedial investigation and feasibility
15 study.

16 So where are we in this process right now? We are
17 right here, at the end of the RI/FS process. At the end
18 of the RI/FS process, we come to the public. We present
19 a proposal, which we call there's a proposed plan. We
20 have seen the fact sheet already that summarizes exactly
21 what the RI/FS is, and based on the input of the
22 community, and also the state -- by the way, state
23 project manager is sitting right here, Prabhakar
24 Kasarabada is here with the state's input -- consultation
25 with the state, consultation with the community, we go on

1 to memorialize the decision, and we call that a record
2 decision. That is not done yet, but we are on the
3 pathway to do that right after this public meeting.

4 The public meeting, this public meeting has a 30-day
5 comment period, which started the 21st of April and is
6 going to end on the 22nd of May. And then we're going to
7 go on to RD/RA, which is design and implementation, and
8 all the way down to site we use and site (inaudible) and
9 site we use.

10 This is basically a figure of the site, another
11 picture which tells you exactly how large the site is.
12 As you all know, this is Nappanee, and this is Hively,
13 Oakland, and the river to the north. That's how the
14 dimension of the site was first stated when we did the
15 site, when we list the site on the NPL.

16 As you know, we saw the pictures. The site is huge.
17 It's about 800 acres of residential, commercial, and
18 industrial area. And the water, the drinking water is
19 provided by the private wells and municipal wells in some
20 areas. As you all know, this is a heavy industrial and
21 manufacturing area, and we did find contamination in the
22 private wells, the TCE -- which is called the
23 trichloroethene -- tetrachloroethylene, and DCE.

24 This basically sums up the history of the site on
25 one chart. It's quite busy, as you can see, because it

1 goes back to 1985, when the site was identified as having
2 a problem with groundwater. And a lot of the work has
3 already been done since that time by Elkhart County
4 Health Department. IDEM was involved. EPA was involved
5 too, and EPA has taken many actions for providing hookups
6 to water mains already and also giving homeowners
7 filtered water whenever a house is contaminated above the
8 MCL, which is the maximum contaminant limit for a
9 contaminant.

10 All the focus here is since 1985. You can see 2005,
11 there have been issues, and we're taking caring of those
12 issues through removal actions, and done by EPA and also
13 by the state. As you can see, 20 years of continued
14 operation and maintenance done by IDEM, they found out
15 that over 20 years, the contamination should have gone
16 down, but it didn't. It went up in some areas. So then
17 they contacted EPA when they found 700 PPE of TCE, and
18 they did their own investigations and collected 119
19 groundwater samples and five different sampling
20 (inaudible), and they found exceedences of the MCL. MCL
21 is the standard for drinking water. So one of the
22 compounds was TCE, which exceeded in the private wells,
23 and that's when they alerted EPA, and that's how the site
24 was listed, was proposed on the NPL, and it was finalized
25 in 2008. March 2008 is when the site was finalized on

1 the NPL, and that's when I came in and started the
2 investigations.

3 And this basically tells in a nutshell what we did
4 for the potential source areas. The first thing we did
5 when we first came on the site was to find out where it
6 might be coming from. What is the source of this
7 contamination? And we did quite a bit of investigation
8 to find out exactly the sources at 15 different
9 facilities. We had limited funds, so we were not able to
10 collect a lot of samples. As you can imagine, 15
11 facilities would require a lot of samples to be
12 collected, but we were not able to collect a lot of
13 samples. We collected samples at each location, four
14 samples from each location, at least four geographical
15 locations. And at each location, we have many samples
16 underground that we have to collect. 73 groundwater
17 samples, 76 PVC temporary wells were installed, and we
18 also collected 11 groundwater samples from existing
19 monitoring wells.

20 This basically -- the slide tells you exactly what
21 we've been doing all these -- right after the site was
22 listed on NPL. We collected about 331 groundwater
23 samples, 49 private well samples, 135 vertical profile
24 samples, three different ground (inaudible) private well
25 samples -- sorry, (inaudible) ground samples, and 53

1 groundwater at the shallow level, and a number of vapor
2 intrusion samples, which you'll see the results later on.
3 This is something historical that we have seen already in
4 that slide that I showed you the timeline of exactly the
5 nature and extent of the contamination. I'm not going to
6 spend a lot of time on the slide, just to show you the
7 amount of work that was done both by EPA and IDEM
8 historically.

9 This is the work that was done in 2010. As I said,
10 2010, we collected private well samples, and we
11 identified two of the private well samples had VOCs above
12 the MCL. Important thing to note here that the
13 prevailing contaminant here at Lusher is mostly VOCs. We
14 are not seeing any pesticide PCVs or semi-volatiles or
15 metals, for that matter, as a contaminant of concern. So
16 the most critical contaminant of concern is our VOCs.

17 Some more work that we did of groundwater samples,
18 including the vapor intrusion samples that Keith talked
19 about that we collected in different steps. The first
20 thing that we have to do is to see if the groundwater at
21 the shallow level is contaminated. If the groundwater at
22 the shallow level is contaminated, then we go in the next
23 step is to collect samples at the soil gas samples to see
24 if the gases are coming out of the soil.

25 Then we collect samples at the subsurface below the

1 foundation of the house and also collect indoor air
2 samples. So we have to collect the dust to see if all
3 those samples that you're collecting are showing
4 contamination above the screening level. Then we can
5 take action. So the pictures, photographs of sampling
6 work done, geoprobe sampling, sampling machine here,
7 another one here, groundwater monitoring samples. This
8 is another air sample that we are taking. Some more
9 drilling work. Indoor air samples that were collected.

10 So based on all the sampling that we found, that we
11 did, we found that we had considerable contamination at
12 least at the Sturgis facility, which is the monitoring
13 well 005, shows the maximum contamination there. We have
14 TCE as a major source of concern, vapor intrusion
15 concern. PCE was also detected, and some other
16 contaminants such as DCE, benzene, methylene chloride,
17 which all exceeded MCLs. And there is contamination at
18 the shallow level, some contamination at the intermediate
19 level, but no contamination above the MCL at the deep
20 level. So this shows you the different -- the level of
21 contamination we found here.

22 Basically, this is the groundwater that we are
23 looking at, the St. Joseph aquifer, sand and gravel. It
24 had some discontinuous (inaudible). The flow direction
25 is that way, so basically, it is flowing towards the

1 river. As you can see, that direction somehow changes
2 towards this way when we come close to the river. So
3 that is very critical to know, because when we make a
4 decision about remediation, we need to know which way the
5 groundwater is going and flowing.

6 As I said, the main contaminant is TCE. PCE is also
7 found in some areas, but mostly it's TCE. This is a
8 figure that basically was -- came to the conclusion based
9 on the sampling that we did, and this is basically very
10 critical as part of our remediation proposal is
11 concerned. What you see here is a large plume of TCE
12 contamination, and also you see a Gemeinhardt plume,
13 which we have verified it is not part of the Lusher
14 plume. It's a separate plume by itself. There's another
15 small plume here, and there's a plume there, and
16 basically what -- you'll see later on in my slides, we'll
17 come back to the slide and tell you exactly how are we
18 going to provide remediation based upon the contamination
19 that we find in a little bit.

20 As Keith mentioned about vapor intrusion, first
21 thing that we do is sample over the groundwater at the
22 shallow level, and based on the contamination at the
23 shallow level, we found an area of contamination, an area
24 of concern for vapor intrusion. And I'm sure you see the
25 picture, this is the dotted line here in the pink area.

1 That's the area of vapor intrusion. The concern of vapor
2 intrusion is right in that dotted area.

3 We did some risk assessment, and based on that, we
4 sampled many properties, and we found there is a risk
5 hazard, risk inhalation hazard for, basically, TCE.
6 Based on the sampling that we did, the vapor intrusion,
7 there were five residences or 17 percent of residences
8 that we sampled are Category 1; 38 percent of residences
9 are Category 2; and 45 percent are Category 3. That
10 basically tells us that although all the homes that we
11 sampled do not have a problem right now, but we do not
12 say -- we do not back out and say we sampled, there's no
13 problem. We have to go back and resample. That's when
14 we decided to go with the proactive or preemptive
15 measure, which is instead of going and sampling and
16 resampling over the years, the best way to handle this
17 contamination is to preemptively or proactively provide a
18 remediation so we don't have to go back and sample every
19 home for the next five, ten, fifteen years. That was the
20 logic and the rationale behind the preemptive vapor
21 intrusion mitigation proposal that we are proposing
22 today.

23 Another decision-making guideline that you see here
24 from the Region 5 guidance document, again, I come back
25 to the same slide as you saw before. This dotted line is

1 the area of vapor intrusion, according to our numerous
2 groundwater -- shallow groundwater sampling that we did.
3 Okay. As I said, the Gemeinhardt plume has got no
4 connection with -- to our knowledge based on our sampling
5 effort, the Gemeinhardt plume has got no connection with
6 the Lusher plume. So what we did was basically we
7 created then an area of concern by looking at the
8 contamination of where it is and where it might go in the
9 future. We said that any home that is in the area of
10 concern for using private wells should be connected to
11 water mains, and I'll come -- how are we going to do
12 that? I'll explain a little bit later. But basically,
13 we have decided that all the homes who are still relying
14 on private wells should be hooked up because of the TCE
15 contamination in this area.

16 So based on our calculation, we have come up with 72
17 homes that will be hooked up to water mains. That number
18 may change, because the houses are converting. The
19 houses get demolished, you know, or whatever, so we will
20 probably have to do another assessment to see exactly how
21 many homes are there now. But based on our initial
22 assessment, we estimate that there are 72 homes that need
23 to be converted from private well drinking water to
24 municipal drinking water connections.

25 And the two areas to see in this map here,

1 southeastern area is excluded because we haven't find --
2 we didn't find any contamination there, and also the
3 groundwater contamination is flowing this way, so we have
4 no reason to believe that this is going to flow
5 backwards. So that is an area of exclusion from our
6 remediation plan.

7 The other area of exclusion is on the northeast
8 area. The southeast here and northeast on the top.
9 Similarly, the groundwater, we know, is flowing towards
10 the river. It's going in that direction, and we do not
11 believe that those homes are going to be on the receiving
12 end of the contamination. So if you add all these black
13 dots that you see on this map, they will come to about
14 72, approximately, and that's the number of homes that we
15 will be providing, as a proposal right now, connections
16 to water mains.

17 And this black dotted line is where the vapor
18 intrusion homes are, and we have estimated that about 200
19 homes in that area that need to be provided with some
20 sort of mitigation for vapor intrusion proactively,
21 because we did not go and sample every one of those 200
22 homes, because it's impossible to sample that, because we
23 don't have the money right now to do that. So we took a
24 sample of that population. We were hoping to sample
25 about 45 wells -- or 45 homes. We were able to get

1 access to only 29 or so. And based on that, we are
2 making a proposal that preemptively we need to provide a
3 mitigation for vapor intrusion for all those 200 homes in
4 that dotted area.

5 And this purple line that you see is a buffer area
6 that we created because of the complexity of the
7 groundwater flow is a 500-foot buffer all around the
8 Lusher plume. So these homes, which may not be in the
9 pathway, are also included in the mitigation, because
10 they are somehow falling in the buffer area, the 500-foot
11 buffer area around the plume, the contaminated
12 groundwater.

13 But that leads me to, well, we know there's a
14 problem. We know there's a problem with groundwater, and
15 we also know there's a problem with vapor intrusion. So
16 what can we do about it? And by law, we have to have an
17 assessment of alternatives, and we took three
18 alternatives. One is no action where we don't do
19 anything. We just have to do it by law because we can
20 compare. And No. 2 is to provide those homes with
21 filtration systems, like point-of-contact filtration
22 system or a simple filtration system so the contamination
23 is filtered out before they drink or use that water in
24 each of those homes, and we evaluate exactly the cost of
25 those -- of that option, 1.7 million. And Alternative 3,

1 which is the municipal water supply, connecting those 72
2 homes to municipal supply, Elkhart water district, was
3 about \$2 million. That was the proposal that we
4 evaluated.

5 Now, based on these three options, EPA's
6 recommendation is to go with No. 3, and you'll see later
7 on how did we come to that decision. I'll explain that
8 to you later in my next few slides.

9 So the second problem we have -- so we talked about
10 groundwater issue. Now we're talking about a vapor
11 intrusion issue. I showed you the area of concern for
12 vapor intrusion, and I said about 200 homes in that area,
13 right? That is the area that we are trying to address
14 those homes by first option, don't do anything about it,
15 but we will be leaving a human health issue at that site,
16 so we can't do that.

17 Second option is to SSD. SSD is what Keith
18 mentioned is sub-slab depressurization system. Sub-slab
19 depressurization system, which I'll show you some
20 pictures of exactly what it looks like. Keith showed you
21 too. I've got some pictures too exactly how that works.
22 Basically taking the vapors out of the basement
23 foundation through some sort of a fan, electric fan that
24 creates sort of negative pressure, and throw it outside.
25 Basically, that's exactly what it is.

1 The third option is, in addition to SSD, which is
2 sub-slab depressurization, we are also talking about a
3 passive barrier, which is nothing but a sealant, like a
4 paint. In other words, you go in the basement, and you
5 remove all the stuff, clean it up, and then you put some
6 sort of a sealant to cover all the nooks and the cracks,
7 so there's another added benefit of making sure that
8 nothing comes in the house from the foundation or below
9 the foundation. And as you can see, the cost for two,
10 No. 2 is \$800,000, and No. 3 is about \$1.7 million. And
11 EPA's recommendation is to go with No. 2.

12 And this is a picture, a schematic, per se, of what
13 an SSD looks like for venting the vapors from the crawl
14 space. It's basically the PVC pipe connected to a fan
15 with an exhaust, and as simple as that. And you can have
16 the fan out in the attic, or you can have it outside the
17 building too, so it depends on exactly how the house is
18 built, and that can be designed individually for each
19 house.

20 Another picture schematic of an SSD for a sub-slab.
21 Basically, soil gas moving beneath the house. We have
22 the suction fits that are connected to these pipes, PVC
23 pipes, with a fan. It's very similar to radon
24 mitigation. How many of you have heard of radon
25 mitigation? So it works very similar to radon

1 mitigation, just keeping the vapors out of the house,
2 blowing it out.

3 Okay. This is evaluation of different criteria. By
4 law, we have to assess the nine criteria before we select
5 an option for mitigation, and we have to look at the
6 overall protection to human health and environment. Is
7 it complying with federal, state, and local laws? Is it
8 effective in the long-term? Is it easily implementable
9 or not? Is it reducing a reduction of toxicity or
10 (inaudible). In this case we cannot because we are just
11 eliminating or minimizing the risk of that contaminant
12 from injection by connecting homes to a municipal well
13 and also using some sort of technology to eliminate the
14 gases coming in the house. So you're not reducing the
15 contamination. We're just eliminating. That's why we're
16 using this term here as an interim measure. This is an
17 interim measure, and later on we have to address the
18 groundwater in the long-term by removing the
19 contamination altogether from the groundwater. So that's
20 another study that I have to do later on once this is
21 completed. That will be part of my Operable Unit Two
22 study, another RA/FS.

23 So as you can see here, the option that we are using
24 for groundwater is connection to municipal supply or
25 water main connections. That's basically what our

1 preference is, \$2 million, and it meets all the criteria
2 to the extent practicable, and also it's supported by the
3 state. The state is also in favor of this method.

4 By the way, as you already know, the state has been
5 doing a phenomenal job of monitoring and operating the
6 filters for the last 20 years, and I don't think he wants
7 to do that anymore. So we've got to connect those homes
8 that are still relying on filters to the water mains.

9 And the last one, which is the community acceptance,
10 that's when you come in as a community, and you provide
11 your comments and say, hey, we like this. We like this
12 better. So that's when you comment, and we will review
13 and evaluate your comments, and we may not be able to
14 give you your responses today, because that's what the
15 one-month, 30-day public comment period, so you will give
16 your comments to us today verbally, where they will be
17 recorded, and then we will respond in our decision-making
18 process. We will give you a response of what we think
19 about your comment, or how do we want to respond. Okay.

20 The next issue, as you know, vapor intrusion, and
21 our -- again, what we plan to do for this is SSD without
22 the passive barrier. So the only difference between 2
23 and 3 is: 2 is sub-slab pressurization system, and 3 is
24 sub-slab pressurization system plus passive barrier,
25 which is putting on a paint, a sealant.

1 So after assessment of these two or three options,
2 if you call 1 as an option, we believe that it will be
3 cost-effective, it will be preferable, it will be good in
4 the short-term and also provide the protection to the
5 human health and environment by using -- by going with
6 the second option, and that cost for that is about
7 \$800,000. The whole remedy for this project, the interim
8 remedy, as we're calling it, is going to cost us about
9 \$2.8 million, \$2 million for the hookups and \$800,000 for
10 the vapor intrusion mitigation system installation. And
11 again, the state is with us with this preference, and
12 also, we need your comments.

13 Why do we prefer the water supply? Because it's
14 good, lasts forever. You know, it's the best way to
15 handle it rather than keep changing the filters every few
16 years. So connection to water mains is the best way to
17 go if you have contaminated groundwater. And if you're
18 still relying on a private well, that's not the right
19 thing, so we need to have connections. We will need to
20 extend some water mains and provide, of course,
21 connections. And one of the things that is required by
22 this option is to have institution controls, ICs, as we
23 call them, which are part of the deed restrictions or
24 local municipal ordinances. So nobody will be allowed to
25 install a private well on their house. And also, we need

1 to abandon any of the existing private wells from
2 people's homes, because the groundwater is contaminated,
3 and it is not a good idea to tap into that. So that's
4 part of the institution control requirements for this
5 option.

6 For the second issue, SSD, it's a proactive or a
7 preemptive mitigation. Rather than sampling for the next
8 five, ten years, we would like to take care of the
9 problem right now. And how long will that be done?
10 Well, as long as we need, because we haven't addressed
11 the real problem now, which is the groundwater
12 contamination, and that will be addressed in the second
13 part, or as we call it, Operable Unit Two, second phase.
14 We don't call it phase, but we call it Operable Unit,
15 which is the second area that we need to address.

16 We also already saw how this works. Prevents VOCs
17 from entering structures, buildings. And also, this also
18 needs some institutional controls where anybody -- any
19 worker digging the ground will have to have some
20 respiratory protection, because this area does have a
21 problem with vapors in the ground. So ICs will also be
22 part of the option. As Teresa just said, you can provide
23 your comments to us today orally, or you can submit us
24 written comments. You can also do online comments, and
25 here is the link to the online comments. This is

1 basically the same link that you have on your fact sheet,
2 and you can email comments to Cheryl Allen, who is not
3 here, but she is the CIC. CIC is the Community
4 Involvement Coordinator for the Lusher site, so you can
5 send her email if you have any questions and any comments
6 regarding the proposed remedy. Prabhakar is right here.
7 He has been involved and consulted all along and
8 (inaudible).

9 As far as the PRP work, PRP stands for potentially
10 responsible parties. Who is responsible for this
11 contamination? We have identified some facilities that
12 we are working with right now. My attorney is right
13 here. Tom Krueger is sitting right here on the panel,
14 and we have issued some general notice letters to these
15 PRPs that we have identified, and I think with some of
16 them we are communicating also with their attorneys.

17 We have a database of PRPs, a lot of information
18 about a number of facilities that are operating here and
19 have operated in the past, and we are collecting a lot of
20 information as we speak, and also setting up special --
21 we will be sending -- once the ROD is signed, we will be
22 sending out a special notice letter to the PRPs asking
23 them to do the work that needs to be done, which is
24 implement the remedy that we have selected in the ROD --
25 that we will select in the ROD. We haven't selected it

1 yet. We will be selecting it in the Record of Decision.
2 So once we write the ROD and finalize the ROD, we will be
3 sending out a special notice letter, and PRPs hopefully
4 will come forward and participate in the implementation
5 of the remedy that will be selected.

6 And that's basically it. If you have any questions
7 regarding my presentations --

8 DR. FUSINSKI: Let me interject real quick just to
9 explain this better. If you have any questions on the
10 presentation itself, we can answer those. If you have
11 comments or concerns about the proposed remedies, save
12 those till the end, the actual comment period. We won't
13 answer those, but she will record them and put them in,
14 and 30 days later you will get a response in the record.

15 MR. QUADRI: Yes. Absolutely. I think you had a
16 question.

17 MR. DICKERSON: Yeah, a question. You spoke about
18 the potential responsible private parties.

19 MR. QUADRI: Right.

20 MR. DICKERSON: You said that there were nine that
21 you already submitted letters to, but there were -- is
22 there a total of 40 potential responsible parties, or was
23 that 40 plus the nine?

24 MR. QUADRI: You're saying exactly how many PRPs
25 there are?

1 MR. DICKERSON: Correct.

2 MR. QUADRI: You know, there are many facilities
3 that we are targeting. Some facilities we have
4 information from and some we don't. So if we say PRP,
5 that means a potentially responsible party that we have
6 identified based on their geographical location and based
7 on what they do, but initially what we do is we
8 identified them, and then we send out what we call an
9 information and request letter, and we ask them to
10 provide us with information about what did they do, what
11 operation do they have in the facility, and what kind of
12 chemicals they use and what kind of disposal practices
13 they have over the years, and then we decide based on the
14 response whether they are liable or not.

15 MR. DICKERSON: Thank you. And then additionally,
16 the homeowners and businesses of the community that are
17 not responsible parties, will there be any cost incurred
18 to them as a result of the mitigation, whether it be
19 pre-mitigation or post?

20 MR. QUADRI: To homeowners, no. To residents, no.

21 MR. DICKERSON: And how about to commercial entities
22 that do not have responsibility as far as the actual
23 remediation?

24 MR. QUADRI: If they're not a responsible party,
25 then they're not liable based on our understanding.

1 MR. DICKERSON: Then as far as the actual systems
2 and the cleanup and everything else, if you didn't cause
3 the contamination, there will be no cost to you for
4 either the systems you spoke about, the water mains being
5 installed in the houses, water mains installed in
6 businesses, venting systems, things like that? Will
7 there be any cost associated to non-responsible parties?

8 MR. KRUEGER: Once they're hooked up to the
9 municipal water (inaudible) there will be a future cost
10 to be hooked up to that system, and similarly, the
11 exhaust fans will throw off some electricity, but the
12 installation cost will be picked up entirely either by
13 the private parties, if they will agree to do the work,
14 or if they're unwilling or unable to do the work, then
15 the EPA Superfund will pick up all the costs and the
16 hookups and installation.

17 MR. DICKERSON: I appreciate that. And then
18 additionally, individuals who reside or own property or
19 have structures inside the contamination area, is it
20 voluntary to participate in the remedial action in terms
21 of the municipal water hookups or the fan option that we
22 spoke about? Is that a voluntary thing?

23 MR. KRUEGER: Well, I think part of what we're doing
24 in reaching out to the community and explaining the
25 rationale behind it and the health risks and the benefits

1 is to persuade everyone that it makes sense to them to be
2 drinking clean water and to eliminate exposure to vapor
3 in their homes.

4 MR. DICKERSON: I appreciate that. I just wanted to
5 know whether or not it was required, or is that
6 voluntary, they can choose not to participate.

7 MR. KRUEGER: Well, again, we're hoping to not have
8 to address that question, but we can't have -- we can't
9 make people agree to do this if they're unwilling to do
10 it, for the most part. Now, I mean, if they really are
11 endangering the health of themselves and their families,
12 there are some potential enforcement steps that the
13 government can take. We would be extremely hesitant to
14 try to do something like that unless it was a grave
15 health emergency.

16 MR. DICKERSON: I appreciate that. And then last
17 question would be you spoke about the institutional
18 control, basically you're asking local government to
19 possibly pass ordinance. In regard to that, being on the
20 county council, do you anticipate asking local government
21 (inaudible).

22 MR. KRUEGER: We intend to work closely with the
23 city to see what makes sense in terms of protecting
24 people who would be doing excavating in the area.

25 MR. DICKERSON: Thank you.

1 MR. KRUEGER: And just to go back to your original
2 -- or to your first question, Syed indicated that we
3 would send formal notice letters to nine parties telling
4 them that they are potentially responsible based on what
5 we know. And that's not a determination of liability,
6 but it's based on what we know at this point. As Syed
7 indicated, the investigation is still continuing. The
8 other 40 parties are parties that we sent questionnaires
9 to gather more information about what they know about
10 chemicals they use, disposal practices and so on. We're
11 trying to gather information in all the ways that we can
12 to see if we can identify people who may have contributed
13 to the contamination to see if we can get them to
14 contribute to the solution if that's the case.

15 MR. DICKERSON: And then do you have a time frame as
16 far as when you will send out the letters to the
17 potentially responsible parties?

18 MR. KRUEGER: Our typical practice is once we issued
19 a Record of Decision, we would issue what Syed referred
20 to as a special notice letter, which is an invitation to
21 negotiate, and it sets up a period of about 220 days to
22 see if we can reach an agreement. If we're unable to do
23 that, we can either extend that time period or decide to
24 just have the government pay for it and then seek to get
25 reimbursement later. Yes.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 5: At what point and how soon
2 would you identify publicly the PRPs?

3 MR. QUADRI: The question was how -- at what point
4 and how quickly would you identify PRPs?

5 MR. KRUEGER: The nine notice letters that Syed
6 referred to are public documents, so those parties have
7 been identified. I do want to emphasize the P at the
8 beginning of potentially responsible parties. It is
9 we've just identified those people who may have an
10 interest which invites them to talk with us about any
11 number of issues, from whether they think they have
12 defenses or we're mistaken to what they might like to do.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 6: I'd like to see the mayor
14 at the next meeting. He seems to be so interested in
15 everybody's water. I think he needs to be here.

16 MR. DICKERSON: I'll pass on the message.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 6: (Inaudible.) All we ever
18 hear is (inaudible). He needs to be here.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 7: This has been investigated
20 or at least brought to your attention since 1985. And in
21 looking at the map, I see five different orders, whether
22 it's the broad Superfund area, the smaller area, the
23 plume, the buffer. How much has that changed over the
24 last 30 years? How much can we anticipate it changing?

25 MR. QUADRI: Back in 1985, there wasn't as extensive

1 a study as we did, because it was not a Superfund site
2 then. In 1985, this was not a Superfund site. It was
3 just a site that EPA -- I think it was an EPA database.
4 And IDEM has been providing the operation and maintenance
5 of the filters at these seven, eight, ten homes just as
6 part of the action taken by IDEM and removal action taken
7 by EPA. The site was listed with the NPL in 2008.
8 That's when the real detailed investigation started. We
9 hired a contractor and spent money on it, did a lot of
10 sampling. You can see the amount of work that was done
11 in the last, you know, few years once the site was listed
12 with the NPL.

13 So to answer your question, I think that the
14 contamination has gone down a little bit. The
15 contamination does show to have reduced to a certain
16 extent, but still is contaminated, and we're addressing
17 it.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 7: Reduced in toxicity or --

19 MR. QUADRI: No, not toxicity, but the
20 concentrations are not as (inaudible) in general area.
21 In some areas, the concentration is very high. As you
22 can see, the Sturgis area, the monitoring wells were very
23 high there. The concentration was very high. But
24 generally, the trend was the reducing trend.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 7: The concentration is

1 reducing or the geographical area of the plume is
2 reducing?

3 MR. QUADRI: I don't think I can answer that
4 question very well, because, you know, we did not do, as
5 I said, as extensively as -- as many samples as we took
6 now were not taken then. But the numbers that we've
7 taken now does show a declining trend, so maybe there's
8 some sort of, you know, dissipation, volatilization,
9 dispersion, or maybe even to a certain extent
10 bioremediation may be happening. We don't know that for
11 sure.

12 DR. FUSINSKI: I want to add one thing. Vapor
13 intrusion is a relatively new science that we just
14 realized is happening. So there's been other sites where
15 people have VOCs in the groundwater where we went out
16 (inaudible) in the municipal water and said, okay, the
17 situation is taken care of, but now we realize, oh, wait,
18 there's another problem that we didn't realize before.
19 So vapor intrusion is something that it's actually a
20 relatively new science. We didn't realize it was
21 happening before. So all this is actually relatively new
22 to the EPA in the last 15, 20 years.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: I have two questions. One
24 of them is in regards to the vapor intrusion ventilation
25 system, if I may refer to it in that manner. I have a

1 basement with five rooms. Does that mean they put one
2 hole down and vent it from that one hole? I can't see
3 those fumes coming from room 5 to room 1 where the hole
4 is put down and being effective. So how do you handle a
5 situation like that?

6 DR. FUSINSKI: It's based on square footage.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: Pardon me?

8 DR. FUSINSKI: It's based on square footage.
9 There's actually studies that they'll do to see how many
10 depressurization systems they need to put in, how many
11 ports. It's all based on square footage.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: But you're venting from
13 underneath the floor, right?

14 DR. FUSINSKI: So you're pulling everything toward
15 that vent. From underneath the house, everything gets
16 pulled toward that vent.

17 MR. QUADRI: And by the way, you know, that's a good
18 question, actually. That could be -- that is a question
19 that can be designed in our -- the next phase of the
20 project is to design the implementation of this venting.
21 So if your house is so unique that it needs to be
22 specifically designed for SSD, then we may have to do
23 that. And as Keith said, it also depends on the square
24 footage and how big your house is and exactly how many
25 ports do we need to vacuum out the vapors.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: And my other question is
2 the first meeting you all had here, I asked such
3 questions, for example, what specific carcinogens and
4 things of this matter as to contaminants were found and
5 in what concentrations. Couldn't get an answer then.
6 Are there answers now, and are there any handouts to be
7 had?

8 MR. QUADRI: I don't think we have any handouts
9 right now, but as you saw in the presentation, the
10 concentration, depending on what chemical you're talking
11 about, there are so many VOCs. The main contaminant is
12 TCE, and it depends on what sample you're talking about.
13 A sample at Sturgis, some samples were as high as 2,500
14 PPB off of a contaminant. So exactly what contaminant
15 you're talking about, exactly what location you're
16 talking about, so if you want to stick around maybe after
17 the meeting, I can show you. We have a key to a table
18 and figures that show you exactly where the contamination
19 -- what contaminants were found where. I can show you
20 the map, and I can -- after the meeting, if you sit down
21 a little bit, I can show you exactly what contamination
22 was found in our investigation. Yes.

23 MS. DOTY: First of all, can I get a copy of that or
24 a website I can go to get this presentation?

25 MR. QUADRI: Yes. What I think we need to do is

1 Teresa -- she's not here now. What I will do is --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Look behind you.

3 MS. JONES: I'm right here.

4 MR. QUADRI: Sorry. We will put this thing on the
5 -- is it possible to put this thing on the web?

6 MS. JONES: Yes.

7 MR. QUADRI: So what we'll do is tomorrow we'll put
8 this thing on the EPA web page. How is that?

9 MS. DOTY: Yes. Thank you very much. Second
10 question is: In the meantime, if we're down working in
11 our basements, is like opening the door to the outside
12 going to be good enough, opening a window? I mean, what
13 do we do in the meantime?

14 DR. FUSINSKI: You have to remember that the risk
15 levels that we come up with are based on 24 hours a day,
16 30 days exposure in 30 -- 24 hours a day, 350 days a year
17 for 30 years. So yeah, if you can ventilate it, open a
18 door, open the windows while you're down there, it's
19 always helpful.

20 When you talk about the risk levels I look at, when
21 I say it's unacceptable, it's basically you never leave
22 your basement. So you running down there doing something
23 for a couple hours in the evening, that's fine. But I
24 want to protect you from any exposure whatsoever, and
25 that's what these sub-slab depressurization systems

1 actually do. Because if the concentrations go up -- like
2 I said, the groundwater is actually what's contaminated,
3 and those vapors can fluctuate, so you may have nothing
4 one day and a lot the next day. The idea is to get these
5 systems in so you're not exposed at all, because every
6 bit of exposure of a carcinogen increases your chance of
7 getting cancer. There's one back there first.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 8: I just want to know how you
9 get your house tested, because I'm smack dab in the
10 middle of it.

11 DR. FUSINSKI: The idea is don't worry about getting
12 your house tested. Let us come in and put the system in.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 8: So how are you going to
14 know where I live? Are you going to knock on my door?

15 DR. FUSINSKI: Once we get done with this question
16 and answer period, we're going to do the public comment
17 period.

18 MR. QUADRI: Right.

19 DR. FUSINSKI: And that's when we want to know do
20 you have a comment about our alternatives, if you agree
21 with our alternatives, or if you disagree and why. Let
22 us know, and in 30 days, they can move forward with the
23 next steps.

24 MR. QUADRI: And remember, we haven't made a
25 decision yet. We are proposing this, and we need your

1 comments, so if your question is when are we going to
2 come and knock on your door for this work, we don't know
3 that yet because we haven't memorialized this decision
4 yet. We still have to make this decision on the record.
5 We haven't done that yet. Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: Would I be correct in
7 saying that like a TCE contaminant plume coming up in my
8 basement has been saturating my floor joists for X number
9 of years?

10 DR. FUSINSKI: It is not a liquid. The TCE, the
11 liquid TCE, as you call it, is in the groundwater. So
12 anything coming up, that picture I showed you with the
13 houses and the plume, basically the TCE has to be on the
14 surface of the groundwater, it has to volatilize, it has
15 to get through the deep soil all the way up to the house.
16 So basically it's just a gas that's underneath your
17 house.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: I understand that.

19 DR. FUSINSKI: It's not something that's going to
20 absorb into your concrete or anything like that. It's
21 basically finding its way through cracks and crevices is
22 what it's doing. It's just like, you know, if you run
23 water through a pipe, it wants to look for the path of
24 least resistance.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: But if you take a gas, if

1 it's ventilated from the floor up into the ceiling of
2 your basement and your floor joists, if it isn't vented
3 out of the house, then it's saturating the floor joists.
4 Am I not correct?

5 DR. FUSINSKI: I've never seen any -- I'm not going
6 to say no, because I've never seen --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: Otherwise why do you all
8 worry about even venting it if that's not happening?

9 DR. FUSINSKI: Because it actually -- it's a gas
10 that hangs out in -- you can't smell it. You don't know
11 it's there. And it can accumulate to levels that can get
12 toxic, and the idea is to get it out of your house.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 9: What happens to the vapor
14 once it's out?

15 MR. QUADRI: If we put a sub-slab depressurization
16 system on and it goes up into the air, it basically
17 breaks down in UV light. It doesn't become (inaudible).

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What if it's raining?

19 DR. FUSINSKI: There's still UV with clouds.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 9: And the attorney here, you
21 actually think this company is going to come to you and
22 say, oh, yeah, I think we were a part of that; how much
23 do you want?

24 DR. FUSINSKI: That would be nice.

25 MR. QUADRI: Well, we hope so. Yes.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: Okay. You said your
2 (inaudible) on there says since 1985.

3 MR. QUADRI: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: So in your estimating, how
5 much progress have they made since '85? Why is it
6 30 years later is it proposed? Number one, Mayor Moore
7 wants to do it, and 70 more people on the water system so
8 he can hold (inaudible) on water?

9 DR. FUSINSKI: That's saved for the public comment
10 period.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: Takes 30 years to find out
12 you've got a problem, and all at once the mayor wants
13 more money. He's got a loan in Bristol being at
14 (inaudible). We're broke. I mean, you know, that's out
15 of it, but you know what I'm saying.

16 DR. FUSINSKI: We need to put that in the public
17 comment period.

18 MR. QUADRI: It's in the record now, what you said.
19 Last question.

20 MS. JONES: Make this the last question.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 11: There's -- forgive me -- a
22 few parts here. I'm wondering, though, ecologically,
23 we're surrounded by the St. Joe River. Now, what of the
24 impact to the waterway? That will be question one.

25 Two, I have several properties which looks to be on

1 the fringe, so you have properties identified by address
2 so I can see if those addresses are listed?

3 And then finally, you know, I'm not in your
4 business, but I would hope in 1985 that the rate of
5 travel of this plume, which looks to be a very
6 significant plume by size and structure, that the
7 migration of it, by travel towards the waterway, gives
8 you an idea of where it began and about where it began,
9 because we just had a Superfund site on John Weaver
10 Parkway that was remediated or still in that remediation.
11 My concern as a city official is 51 percent of our total
12 water comes from North Main Street well field, and we
13 have intercepted wells or a plume like this will shut us
14 down, essentially. What is the most local uptake of city
15 water in the area? How far away is the plume from one of
16 our wells?

17 MR. QUADRI: Two questions you asked. One question
18 was about the...

19 MR. DICKERSON: Ecologicals.

20 MR. QUADRI: Ecologicals, and I believe -- we
21 believe we have done some sampling work, and we have
22 estimated based on -- we have ecological risk assessments
23 also done. We don't think that there's any ecological
24 risk from the levels that are there right now in the
25 groundwater, number one.

1 Number two, whether we can say clearly, definitely,
2 who is responsible, because there's so many facilities
3 out there -- that was your second question, how can you
4 determine where it's coming from, if I understand your
5 question correctly, because there's so many facilities,
6 it's everywhere, big and small, we haven't done any
7 detailed investigation at those facilities. That's the
8 purpose of the identification of PRPs is to find who
9 those PRPs are and then maybe have an agreement with them
10 to do an investigation of their own properties based on
11 EPA's oversight. That's basically what we want to do.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 11: The B, second of that, and
13 I poorly joined it together, was you're following a plume
14 from 1985, and I guess my point is, proactively, is if
15 51 percent of the city's total water supply comes within
16 a two-block radius, proactively says we would be testing
17 these people in their disposal of chemicals prior to a
18 plume developing, I wish there was a way to get ahead of
19 the plume. Legal or not, I don't know.

20 MR. QUADRI: Are you talking about --

21 DR. FUSINSKI: Do you want to say something about
22 that?

23 MR. EARLE: Sure. (Inaudible) groundwater
24 protection zone that's intended to address that, and I
25 believe Elkhart County also has some ordinances that are

1 designed to try to prevent the plumes. Now, the Main
2 Street well plume is -- Main Street site is north of the
3 river and not related to the Lusher Street site.

4 MR. DICKERSON: How about the south well field, are
5 you familiar?

6 MR. EARLE: I did look where the south well field
7 is. It's also not related to the Lusher site. I don't
8 know what's going on there, if there is anything going
9 on.

10 MR. DICKERSON: The question would be -- correct me
11 if I'm wrong, Dave. The question would be then: Will
12 this plume have any potential impact on the well fields
13 that we have on the City of Elkhart?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 11: And if we react to the
15 plume, the job is already done. Once you infect your
16 wells, your wells are done. (Inaudible) dollars apiece.
17 There's 19 of them within two blocks. So I guess I'm
18 pushing, as a constituent of the EPA, to say get ahead of
19 the curve. Don't wait for the plume. Let's find out
20 what these companies do with their chemicals prior to the
21 plumes developing. Give me a short answer. I mean,
22 that's okay.

23 MR. KRUEGER: Short answer is since 1980, there's
24 been a lot more regulation on companies that generate
25 hazardous substances on an ongoing basis. A lot,

1 although not all, but a lot of the cleanup that's gone on
2 historically in Elkhart dates back to disposal that
3 occurred before 1980 when we started being more active
4 and proactive in trying to make sure that wastes were
5 safely disposed of or reset or reused. So we have been
6 trying to get ahead of the curve, but there's still a lot
7 of history that we have to undo, and for better or worse,
8 that's where the big focuses of our Superfund program
9 (inaudible).

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 11: It's been an excellent
11 presentation. We've started to be here late, but if you
12 had addresses so I would know or be able to print if my
13 properties are --

14 MR. QUADRI: Oh, you mean addresses of the -- yeah.
15 The thing is a lot of the information is confidential.
16 We don't want to give out the addresses and the names of
17 homeowners living in this area out to the public. So
18 what we have done is you see -- by the way, all this
19 information, the RA/FS documents, all the documents that
20 we have published as part of the study are also available
21 on the Internet and also in the library. So if you want
22 to go and look at these documents, you're free to do that
23 too. Elkhart Library has got files, site files, where
24 you would find the RA/FS and the risk assessment
25 documents in there, by the way. CD has been sent over

1 there. Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: Seriously, since 1985,
3 when Gemeinhardt started, what is the percentage of
4 cleanup in that area?

5 MR. QUADRI: Well, the cleanup is already going on
6 right now. They're doing --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: I know it's going on, but
8 what is the percentage of cleanup?

9 MR. QUADRI: On top of my head, I don't know. I do
10 know that Gemeinhardt cleanup is continuing pump and
11 treat. They have a stripper there, and they're doing a
12 pump and treat. And exactly how the levels are in the
13 last 20 years, I don't know. But I do know that there is
14 a treatment going on right now, and it's being cleaned
15 and is being contained with that pump and treat.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: Didn't a lot of this start
17 back in the '60s and move to the (inaudible).

18 MR. QUADRI: I don't know that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: I do. Thank you.

20 MR. QUADRI: One last question.

21 MS. JONES: One last question.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 12: For us who are not hooked
23 up to city water, are you going to make sure we get by
24 with water to us till we can get this taken care of?

25 MR. QUADRI: Right now, based on our sampling, we

1 don't know any home that has exceeded the MCL. That's a
2 question. If your home has exceeded the MCL, then of
3 course you should be given bottled water. But based on
4 your sampling that we did -- so Elkhart County Health
5 Department has a program where if you feel -- if you want
6 to know is my water safe, is my water above the MCL or
7 below, you can ask them to take a sample from your home.
8 I think it's a system that --

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 12: I asked them over and over
10 and over.

11 MR. QUADRI: But I know that they have some program
12 where samples can be collected if you are interested.
13 There's a very minute, \$25, \$30 cost, I think, for taking
14 a sample and having it analyzed. So is anybody here from
15 Elkhart County?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 13: We were given a list of
17 certified labs.

18 MR. QUADRI: Okay.

19 MS. JONES: Okay. Okay. Due to time constraints,
20 we're going to cut off the question and answer session at
21 this point, and we're going to open up the comment
22 period. So even if you have a question, you can state
23 that question for the record, and your question will be
24 responded to at a later date, 30 days from now in a
25 response. So if anyone would like to come forward,

1 please state your name and spell your first and last name
2 for the court reporter.

3 Is there anyone that would like to make a comment
4 for the record? There are no comments? Okay.

5 MS. DOTY: I guess my question would be --

6 MS. JONES: Okay.

7 MS. DOTY: Do you want me to state my name?

8 MS. JONES: Yes, please.

9 MS. DOTY: Laura Doty.

10 MS. JONES: Would you mind? If you're able, would
11 you mind coming forward?

12 MS. DOTY: Oh, going up?

13 MS. JONES: Thank you.

14 MS. DOTY: My question is: Why not go with the full
15 treatment for the VOCs to also have a sealant? I know
16 it's more expensive, but then you would be guaranteed.
17 Was there a reason to not go with a sealant as well as a
18 ventilating system?

19 MS. JONES: And could you give your first and last
20 name, please.

21 MS. DOTY: It's Laura Doty.

22 COURT REPORTER: Spell it, please.

23 MS. DOTY: L-a-u-r-a D-o-t-y.

24 MS. JONES: Thank you. Is there any -- would you
25 like to -- okay.

1 MS. RUTLEDGE: Diane Rutledge, and I would like to
2 thank Brian Dickerson for asking all the questions I
3 wanted to ask.

4 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

5 MS. RUTLEDGE: I want to thank Brian Dickerson for
6 asking all the questions I wanted to ask.

7 MS. JONES: Is there anyone else? Okay.

8 MR. BRADLEY: Lee Bradley.

9 MS. JONES: Could you --

10 MR. BRADLEY: Bradley, B-r-a-d-l-e-y. Having past
11 experiences with it in other cities, do you have any idea
12 what it does to the property values to know that you have
13 pipes sticking up out of your roof and someone asking
14 what is that? You know, geez, ten years ago we had
15 contaminated vapors, water, whatever, talking about it.
16 I'd like to know how that affects property values. I
17 guess that's it.

18 MS. JONES: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else
19 that would like to make a comment? I will take that as a
20 no. All right. Okay.

21 The comment period is officially closed at this
22 time, and the team will be around if anyone has
23 additional questions. And I would like to once again
24 thank everyone for coming out, and I would like to thank
25 the team. And I also would like to thank Gina Campuzano

1 for her assistance as well. Thank you so much. All
2 right. Good evening. Thanks again.

3 (Lusher Street Proposed Plan Public
4 Meeting concluded at 7:52 p.m.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I, JEANNE R. DRUST, a Notary Public, in and for the County of Elkhart and State of Indiana, do hereby certify that on Tuesday, April 29, 2014, at 2222 West Indiana Avenue, Elkhart, Indiana, I then and there reported stenographically the proceedings at the said time and place; that the proceedings were then transcribed from my original shorthand notes; and that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record thereof;

That I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel for any of the parties hereto, nor am I interested directly or indirectly in the outcome of this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
Notarial seal this 9th day of May,
A.D., 2014.



Jeanne R. Drust, AAS
Notary Public, State of Indiana
Residence: Elkhart County
My Commission Expires: 1-17-21